



PRESENT:

Mr. F. Wayne Bass, Chairman
Dr. William P. Brown, Vice Chairman
Mr. Russell Gulley
Mr. Sam R. Hassen
Mr. Reuben J. Waller, Jr.
Mr. Kirkland A. Turner, Secretary to the Commission,
Planning Director

ALSO PRESENT:

Ms. Dorothy Jaeckle, Bermuda District Supervisor,
Board of Supervisors
Mr. William Dupler, Interim Deputy County Administrator
Community Development
Mr. Vlad Gavrilovic, Planning Principal and Senior Designer,
Renaissance Planning Group
Mr. Gregory E. Allen, Planning Manager, Development
Review Section, Planning Department
Mr. James Banks, Assistant Director,
Transportation Department
Ms. Heather Barrar, Principal Planner, Advance Planning and
Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. George "Bubba" Bowles, Senior Engineer
Utilities Department
Mr. Robert V. Clay, Planning and Special Projects Manager,
Development Review Section, Planning Department
Ms. Teresa C. Davis, Planning and Special Projects Coordinator,
Development Review Section, Planning Department
Ms. Barbara Fassett, Planning Manager, Advance Planning and
Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. Steven F. Haasch, Principal Planner, Advance Planning and
Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. Tom Jacobson, Revitalization Director,
Economic Development Department
Mr. Michael Janosik, Planning Administrator,
Development Review Section, Planning Department
Ms. Latisha Jenkins, Revitalization Coordinator,
Economic Development Department
Mr. Glenn E. Larson, Assistant Director, Plans
and Information Section, Planning Department
Ms. Emily Masters, Administrative Secretary,
Advance Planning and Research Section, Planning Department

Mr. R. John McCracken, Director,
Transportation Department
Mr. Richard M. McElfish, Director
Environmental Engineering Department
Ms. Pamela Nichols, Clerk to the Commission,
Administration Section, Planning Department
Ms. Jane Peterson, Planning and Special Projects Manager,
Development Review Section, Planning Department
Ms. Beverly Rogers, Planning Administrator
Planning Department
Ms. Cynthia O. Richardson, Director of Planning,
School Administration
Mr. Carl D. Schlaudt, Planning Manager, Development
Review Section, Planning Department
Fire Chief Loy Senter, Fire Administration,
Fire and EMS
Mr. Steven Simonson, Senior Civil Engineer
Transportation Department
Ms. Traci E. Teasley, Executive Director of Research & Planning,
School Administration
Mr. Michael E. Tompkins, Assistant Director,
Development Review Section, Planning Department
Mr. Rick Witt, Assistant Building Official,
Building Inspection Department
Mr. Dave Wolverton, Microcomputer Analyst
Information Systems Technology
Mr. Bill Wright, Assistant Director Engineering,
Utilities Department

WORK SESSION.

Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen, Waller and staff assembled at 1:00 p. m. in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration Building, 10001 Lori Road Chesterfield, VA, for a work session.

I. CALL TO ORDER.

Mr. Bass, Chairman, called the meeting to order in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration Building.

II. INVOCATION.

Mr. Bass presented the invocation.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The Commissioners led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 22, 2011 MINUTES.

Mr. Gulley requested a revision to the minutes to include the contract negotiations and Request for Proposal (RFP) discussions with Ms. Lorna Parkins, a consultant with the Michael Baker Corporation; and asked the Commission to defer consideration of the minutes to the March 31, 2011 work session.

On motion of Mr. Gulley, seconded by Dr. Brown, the Commission resolved to defer consideration of the minutes to the March 31, 2011 work session.

AYES: Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen and Waller.

On motion of Dr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Gulley, the Commission resolved to schedule the next work session for March 31, 2011.

AYES: Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen and Waller.

Mr. Bass asked the Commission to consider scheduling, at their March 31, 2011 work session, the following dates for the April work sessions: April 14, 2011, April 21, 2011 and April 28, 2011.

- **Discussion on Revised Format of Draft Comprehensive Plan.**

Mr. Waller noted his two (2) requests during a previous work session and asked for clarification on the information tracking process.

In response to Mr. Waller's question, Mr. Turner stated staff was tracking the Commissioners' requests. He stated both staff and the Commission would benefit from a more formal process to track the Commissioners' requests; and asked the Commission to consider voting, as a body, on all requests, in order to minimize misinterpretation of the requests.

Mr. Larson advised the Commission that staff has prepared and maintains a "request for information" list, which is updated based on the Commissioners' requests. He stated included in the Commission's packet is the updated "request for information" list which reflects the status of each request. He also stated staff will continue to work on the Commission's requests; however, it will require additional time to provide all of the information.

Mr. Turner advised the Commission that the formatted Land Use Element does not contain edits from the previous work session because the Commission directed staff to reformat the Land Use Element without any edits. He also stated after the approval of the reformatting, staff will provide the Commission with copies of the new formatted document with edits.

Mr. Gulley stated the Commission needs to understand the approach for development of the elements within the Plan; therefore, staff needs to provide an outline on the philosophical approach for each element.

In response to Mr. Gulley's question, Mr. Turner stated the Plan was built on a building block foundation and agreed it would be helpful for the Commission to understand the context in which the recommendations were prepared. He stated it would be difficult to undertake any one (1) element of the Plan without understanding how they relate together.

Mr. Hassen agreed with Mr. Gulley's philosophy; however, felt the review should include a page by page review. He stated he would like to see some terminology enhanced and strengthened.

Mr. Bass stated the page by page review would include a presentation. He also stated the Plan appears to be incomplete because the origin is not clearly defined.

Dr. Brown stated the Commission would like to know the philosophy behind the approach to the Plan.

Mr. Gulley suggested that as the sections are reviewed, staff would provide the Commission with copies of the proposed changes for review. He stated reviewing the proposed changes would give the Commissioners time to digest the changes prior to discussions.

The Commission recessed at 1:24 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 1:34 p.m.

V. LAND USE DISCUSSION.

Mr. Turner introduced Mr. Vlad Gavrilovic, Planning Principal with the Renaissance Planning Group.

Mr. Gavrilovic provided an overview of the presentation which included a highlight of the Land Use Plan Element; the Land Use Plan Map; and the Place Types and how they relate to the Vision. He stated the presentation would provide an in depth analysis for the proposed centers, corridors. Under the topic Management Growth and Changes, Mr. Gavrilovic discussed demographic, development patterns, environment, public facilities and infrastructure.

Mr. Gulley requested data on percentages and projections for households without children.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated staff would provide the Commission with copies of the issue papers on demographics; and responded to questions from the Commission relative to the proposal for higher densities, revitalization and Urban Development Areas (UDAs).

The Commission questioned whether other County Departments as well as the Department of Utilities supported higher density.

Mr. Turner stated the Department of Utilities would support the Land Use pattern as recommended; however, a concern for many departments would be UDAs. He further stated there was a tremendous effort to link Land Use to all necessary infrastructures; and designating State mandated UDAs has proven to be a challenge for the County.

Mr. Gavrilovic highlighted how the Vision Principles evolved into the foundations of the Comprehensive Plan. He noted the foundations were: improve economic strength and security, enhance the built natural environment, and build livable communities. He highlighted how the Vision principals were translated into the Element. He stated the Plan was structured to include the five (5) Land Use Goals. He further presented the orderly plan structure which was informed by the modeling; how principles were implemented in Land Use Plan map; and scenarios testing.

In response to Mr. Gulley's question, Mr. Gavrilovic stated the Vision drove the model; and that Elements would be achieved through the Implementation Actions.

Mr. Turner stated goals are not established based on ability of today.

In response to Mr. Gulley's question, Mr. Turner stated the County currently evaluates each development proposal based on how they mitigate the impact on public facilities through cash proffer policy; and if they cannot mitigate the impact on the development proposal to the satisfaction of the decision maker, the request is not approved. He added the State Code mandates the designation of UDAs with minimum floor area ratio for commercial and minimum residential density; however, if the Commission receives a development proposal in an UDA and the County cannot service the development, the Commission can deny the request.

Mr. Gavrilovic presented the results of the sample testing for vacant land developed; employment in redeveloped areas; and housing near existing transit. He stated the results of the scenario testing provided evidence that the Vision was closer to the desires expressed by the public than the Current Plan and was more efficient than the Current Plan from a transportation and cost standpoint.

Messrs. Gulley and Waller questioned the statement that the "Vision was more efficient than the Current Plan from a transportation and cost standpoint"; and Mr. Waller asked staff to bookmark the Transportation Department's response to the statement for a later date.

Mr. Gavrilovic then presented data from the Vision to Plan. He stated the Land Use portion of the Vision translated into the draft Thoroughfare and Land Use Maps. He also stated the Draft Land Use Element translates the Countywide Vision into a Land Use policy framework; describes the more physical aspects of the land use policy framework as Place types; and generally maps the Place Types on a draft Land Use Plan Map. Under Land Use Concepts he defined centers, corridors, communities and countryside; and presented visual examples of the categories. In conclusion, Mr. Gavrilovic stated the Land Use Element is a new approach to comprehensive planning founded on Place Type approach, mixed use centers, revitalization and infill, context-sensitive corridors, countryside, integration of Elements and tied to measurable models. He stated at build-out, there was a twenty- eight (28) percent of the Draft Plan over the Current Plan in terms of expenses and revenues and differences. The presentation indicated that the Capital Facility Cost does not include roads or utilities costs.

Dr. Brown requested information on empty (vacant) land in Current Plan recommended for industrial and empty (vacant) land in Draft Plan recommended for industrial.

Mr. Gavrilovic and staff responded to the Commission's questions to include questions relative to Regional Center and UDA; revitalization areas; and Mixed Employment Center.

The Commission recessed at 2:39 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 2:49 p.m.

The Commission reviewed Land Use Policy Element (Chapter III). A summary of the Commission's recommendations, to be voted on at a future work session, is set forth below:

Mr. Waller requested the definitions for centers, corridors, countryside, connections and communities to be added to the glossary.

Mr. Gavrilovic responded to questions on the implementation of UDA; and Building Form.

In response to Mr. Gulley's question, Mr. Larson stated staff will refine and add the definition of Building Form to the glossary; and will provide additional information on the concept of Building Form.

Mr. Gulley questioned if staff could quantify “form based” so it is not interpreted as Countywide.

Goal 1: Quality of Life.

L 1.2.5 Rural Centers: Add wording to read “Encourage limited commercial and service uses at **the best** locations in COUNTRYSIDE areas that provide convenience services to rural communities **when practical from a transportation point of view**”.

L 1.3.3 Infill Development: Add wording to read “Promote infill development and walkability in areas adequately served by transportation infrastructure, public facilities **that respects existing community design**”.

L 1.3.6 Parking in CENTERS: Mr. Gulley asked for an example of shared use of parking facilities; and directed staff to bookmark further discussion on parking structures.

L 1.3.8 Building Reuse: In response to Mr. Hassen’s question, Mr. Steve Haasch stated Action Code A-G 8 addresses reuse of vacant structures.

L. 1.4.3 Connectivity: Add wording to read “**Consider connecting** communities to adjacent development **and public facilities, through streets, sidewalks, and/or trails when appropriate**”.

Mr. Gulley expressed concern that connectivity would create potential funding issues with maintaining the roads.

L. 1.5.5 Adding wording to read “**Higher Density** Residential Uses; and add wording to read “Promote the location of higher density residential uses **in mixed use areas** in proximity to jobs, transportation, public facilities and services”.

L. 1.5.6 Security and Safety: Suggested adding wording at the February 09, 2011 work session to read “**Encourage the incorporation of** security and safety considerations into land use related development decisions”.

L 1.6.2 In response to Dr. Brown’s question, Mr. Haasch stated that there were Action Items addressing land conservation tools.

In response to the Commission’s questions, Mr. Bill Wright stated the Utilities Department and County Administration do not encourage private wastewater treatment facilities for multifamily developments; and it was his understanding that with cluster homes, each home would have a private septic system.

L 1.6.5 Waterwaste Treatment: Suggested adding wording at the February 19, 2011 and March 17, 2011 to read “**Use** individual **residential** onsite private wastewater treatment options in COUNTRYSIDE areas and other areas that will not be served by the public wastewater system”.

In response to a question from the Commission, Mr. Dick McElfish stated he was not aware of any regulations on private septic systems that might be in line with endangering phosphorous runoff.

The Commission bookmarked a response from the Health Department on private septic systems for rural development.

L 1.6.6 Utility Extensions: The Commission reserved comments until review of the Land Use Map.

Goal 2: Economic Growth

L 2.1.1 Protect Economic Development Opportunity Locations: Add wording to read “**Prohibit** residential development in proximity to the airport and any areas where residential/commercial compatibility conflicts could occur”.

Goal 3: Building Community

L 3.2.2 The Commission requested a response from the School Administration on collocation of middle and high schools.

Goal 4: Fiscal Responsibility

L 4.3.2 Was suggested at the February 9, 2011 meeting to delete policy.

Goal 5: Environmental Quality

Create a new L 5.1.6 with wording from N 4.3.5 to read “Water Quality Standards: Proactively ensure compliance with state and federal standards for water quality within Chesterfield County’s streams, lakes and rivers”.

L 5.2.1 Green Development Practices: Add wording to read “Support projects **public and private** that incorporate green development practices for sites and structures.

L 5.2.3 Green Development Practiced: Was suggested at February 9, 2011 meeting to add wording to read “Support projects that incorporate green development practices for sites and structures **where appropriate**”.

IV: Transportation Policy Element Policies Related to Land Use

In response to a question from the Commission, Mr. John McCracken stated the Department of Transportation was not instrumental in the development of the Transportation element; and his Department’s participation in development of the Draft Plan was minimal. He stated his Department reviewed and commented on information that was prepared by the consultants. He also stated prior to the creation of the Thoroughfare Plan, the Department held a series of public meetings in which there were differences of opinions, and at that time, he advised the Board that he could not recommend the adoption of a Thoroughfare Plan that did not include the East-west highway. He stated the East-west highway was and is a critical element for the County’s future.

The Commission held discussions on the East-west highway; requested comments from Economic Development on the East-west highway; and expressed the need to hear the Transportation Department’s specific concerns with the Draft Plan.

Mr. Gulley directed staff to provide the Commission with smaller versions of the current and draft maps.

The Commission directed staff to add the East-west highway back into the Draft Plan; and bookmarked discussions on a memo prepared by Steve Micas in 2002.

In response to a question from the Commission, Mr. McCracken stated his Department had received a summary amount of data from Michael Baker and depending on the responses from Michael Baker, his Department could be prepared to give an initial assessment approximately three (3) weeks from the March 15, 2011 work session.

In response to Mr. Bass' question, Mr. McCracken stated building major arterials does not build sprawl.

The Commission requested an outline for the March 31, 2011 work session.

Mr. Turner reiterated the Commission's request for information.

On motion of Mr. Gulley, seconded by Dr. Brown, the Commission approved the following requests for information: Issue paper on demographics; Footnoted for further discussions that Draft Plan was more efficient than current Plan from a transportation cost standpoint; comparison on vacant land in current Plan recommended for industrial and vacant land in Draft Plan recommended for industrial; reformatted edits; comments from Economic Development relative to the East-west highway; and reduced versions of the draft and current maps.

Ms. McGee apprised the Commission of Mr. Gulley's request for the County Attorney's Office to prepare a more detailed explanation on UDAs.

AYES: Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen and Waller.

Mr. Turner asked if was the consensus of the Commission for staff to provide comments from citizens' meetings based on the section of discussion.

VI. ADJOURNMENT.

On motion of Mr. Gulley, seconded by Dr. Brown, the Commission scheduled the next work session for March 31, 2011.

AYES: Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen and Waller.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, it was on motion of Mr. Gulley seconded by Mr. Waller, that the meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m. to Thursday, March 31, 2011, at 1 p.m. in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration Building, Chesterfield, Virginia.

Chairman/Date

Secretary/Date